

REMARKS

1. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-8, 12-13, 15, 17, 21-27, 31-32, 34, 36, and 38 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,236,977 to Verba et al. (“Verba”). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Verba does not anticipate the claims as amended herein and request that this rejection be withdrawn. Verba teaches computer-implemented marketing and selling of real estate. Although Verba may teach listing of a property with any of several different marketplaces, nowhere does Verba teach a system of managing an entity’s assets by trying to redeploy an asset first internally and then, if that attempted redeployment fails, trying to redeploy the asset either privately or publicly. This serial redeployment of assets starting with internal redeployment distinguishes the present application from Verba

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not showed that Verba discloses serial redeployment of assets starting with internal redeployment and then, failing that, progressing to redeployment privately or publicly, as taught by independent claims 1 and 21. Thus Verba does not teach “permitting the entity to list those select assets listed but not redeployed through the on-line internal trading community with the on-line private trading community or the on-line public marketplace” as recited in claim 1 (and similarly in claim 21), which has been amended to make more clear this process of asset management through serial redeployment in alternative marketplaces. The other rejected claims depend from one

or the other of independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Verba does not teach each and every limitation of the rejected claims and therefore does not anticipate them under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case for the anticipation rejections and request that these rejections be withdrawn.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 11, 16, 28, 30, and 35 as being unpatentable over Verba in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,402 to Popola. Claims 9, 11, and 15 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, whereas claims 28, 30, and 35 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 21. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Verba does not anticipate claims 1 and 21, which disclose serial redeployment of assets starting with internal redeployment and then, failing that, progressing to private or public redeployment. Further, Popola also does not teach or suggest this serial redeployment as taught by independent claims 1 and 21. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Verba and Popola neither teaches nor suggests each and every limitation of the rejected claims and, accordingly, does not make them unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 29 as being unpatentable over Verba in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,915,209 to Lawrence. Claim 10 depends indirectly from claim 1, whereas claim 29 depends indirectly from claim 21. For at least the reasons set forth above,

Applicants respectfully submit that Verba does not anticipate claims 1 and 21, which disclose serial redeployment of assets starting with internal redeployment and then, failing that, progressing to private or public redeployment. Further, Lawrence also does not teach or suggest this serial redeployment as taught by independent claims 1 and 21. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Verba and Lawrence neither teaches nor suggests each and every limitation of the rejected claims and, accordingly, does not make them unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 14, 18, 33, and 37 as being unpatentable over Verba in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,131,087 to Luke et al. Claims 14 and 18 depend directly from claim 1, whereas claims 33 and 37 depend directly from claim 21. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Verba does not anticipate claims 1 and 21, which disclose serial redeployment of assets starting with internal redeployment and then, failing that, progressing to private or public redeployment. Further, Luke also does not teach or suggest this serial redeployment as taught by independent claims 1 and 21. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Verba and Luke neither teaches nor suggests each and every limitation of the rejected claims and, accordingly, does not make them unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

U.S.S.N.: 10/077,546
Filed: February 15, 2002
Amendment and Response to Final Office Action

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the final Office Action of June 18, 2007. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an amendment, please call the undersigned at 404 685-6799. If any additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brenda O. Holmes 40339/
Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339
Attorney for the Assignee

Date: September 18, 2007
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
404.815.6530
Attorney Docket No.: L9090/269360